

Message

From: Myers, Hugh [hugh.myers@doh.hawaii.gov]
Sent: 8/29/2019 9:12:07 PM
To: Shalev, Omer [Shalev.Omer@epa.gov]
CC: Linder, Steven [Linder.Steven@epa.gov]; roxanne.kwan@doh.hawaii.gov; Ichinotsubo, Lene K [lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov]; Perry, Thu [Thu.Perry@doh.hawaii.gov]; TU, LYNDSEY [Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Red Hill AOC | Section 8 Draft Risk Assessment Letter for Review
Attachments: Red Hill Section 8_EPA and DOH Approval and Next Steps_20190702 rev hm rk.docx

Omer,

Latest QRVA draft letter should be good to go.

Vr,
Hugh

Hugh Myers

Red Hill Project Engineer
Solid and Hazardous Waste Branch
State of Hawaii | Department of Health | 2827 Waimano Rd., #100 | Pearl City, HI 96782
Phone: (808)586-4230

From: Kwan, Roxanne S <roxanne.kwan@doh.hawaii.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 26, 2019 8:32 AM
To: Myers, Hugh <hugh.myers@doh.hawaii.gov>; Ichinotsubo, Lene K <lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov>
Subject: RE: Red Hill AOC | Section 8 Draft Risk Assessment Letter for Review

Letter looks good. I accepted all the changes. Any more comments, if not I will send to EPA.

From: Shalev, Omer
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2019 12:32 PM
To: Myers, Hugh <hugh.myers@doh.hawaii.gov>; Ichinotsubo, Lene K <lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov>; roxanne.kwan@doh.hawaii.gov
Cc: Linder, Steven <Linder.Steven@epa.gov>; TU, LYNDSEY <Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov>
Subject: Red Hill AOC | Section 8 Draft Risk Assessment Letter for Review

Hi DOH, We have drafted a letter responding to the Navy's risk assessment work for your review. We decided to take a different approach than the two letter version that was discussed previously over the phone. We have drafted one longer letter that does a few things. The letter attempts to lay out the following:

1. Approve the work as satisfying the requirement of section 8.3., but requires the Navy to do additional work to assess the hazards posed by external hazards (fire, flood, seismic) and link this risk assessment work ultimately to potential risk to receptor through other AOC work.
2. The scope of work that we conditionally approved and the Navy's transmittal letter points out that this QRVA phase 1 was meant to satisfy the 8.3 requirement. This letter follows through on our prior approval.
3. Provide a rationale as to why we believe a mixed qualitative and quantitative approach is more appropriate going forward than purely quantitative for the external hazards.
4. Provide key summary results from the QRVA, but we do not go at length into a review of the ABS models. I don't think DOH or EPA intends to go further into checking calculations.
5. Navy must provide a SOW for EPA DOH approval within 120 days of the date of the letter.
6. Please review and let us know what you think. I will be on leave July 3-17, but Steve will be available to discuss in more detail during that time. Please copy him on any of your responses.

Finally, the risk assessment is available on EPA's website here: <https://www.epa.gov/red-hill/risk-and-vulnerability-assessment-red-hill>

Thanks and have a good holiday.

Omer Shalev
Environmental Engineer
Land, Chemicals and Redevelopment Division (LND-4-3)
EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne St.
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 972-3538